DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 386 406 SO 025 152

AUTHOR Burns, Robin; Weber, Thomas

TITLE Gandhi and Freire on Campus: Theory and Practice in Tertiary Peace Studies Programs. Peace Education Miniprints No. 76.
INSTITUTION Lund Univ. (Sweden). Malmo School of Education.
REPORT NO ISSN-1101-6418
PUB DATE Mar 95
NOTE 45p.
AVAILABLE FROM R&D Group, Preparedness for Peace, School of Education, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmo, Sweden.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Curriculum; College Instruction; College Programs; Colleges; Educational Change; Educational Philosophy; Foreign Countries; Global Approach; Higher Education; International Education; *Peace; *Role of Education; Social Change; Universities
IDENTIFIERS Freire (Paulo); Gandhi (Mahatma); *Peace Education

ABSTRACT

Over the past 20 years, the formal study of peace at universities and colleges has become an option available to many students. The development of such peace studies programs is diverse. There are a variety of theoretical and ideological/philosophical approaches to peace. However, how to develop a course that is theory-based, and to compare different theoretical orientations, has not been explored a great deal. Taking up that challenge, this paper looks at two instructors who have been responsible for a peace studies program, one through taking on and transforming an existing interdisciplinary undergraduate course and the other through developing a peace education course within a graduate education program. The ideas that inspired each educator are presented. Paulo Freiré and Mahatma Gandhi, whose work for justice and social change, are featured. This paper finds that a dialogue that develops the ideas, key concepts, analyses, and actions of Gandhi and Freire (within contemporary settings, and with appropriate learning processes) provides a basis for a peace studies or peace education program. (RJC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Peace Education Miniprints
No. 76
March 1995

ED 386 406

GANDHI AND FREIRE ON CAMPUS: THEORY AND PRACTICE IN TERTIARY PEACE STUDIES PROGRAMS

Robin Burns
Thomas Weber

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. Bjurstedt
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SO 025 152

GANDHI AND FREIRE ON CAMPUS: THEORY AND PRACTICE IN TERTIARY PEACE STUDIES PROGRAMS

Robin Burns and Thomas Weber

Over the past twenty years, the formal study of peace at universities and colleges has become an option available to many students. The development of such peace studies programs is very diverse. There are a variety of theoretical and ideological/philosophical approaches to peace. The Institute for World Order initiated curriculum guides in the early 1980s (under the rubric 'Peace and World Order Studies'), now in a sixth edition. However, how to develop a course which is theory-based, and to compare different theoretical orientations, has not been much explored.

In this paper, the authors take up that challenge. Each of them has been responsible for a peace studies program, one through taking on and transforming an existing interdisciplinary undergraduate course and the other through developing a peace education course within a graduate education program. The ideas which inspired each author are presented. Paulo Freire and Mahatma Gandhi, whose work for justice and social change has been outstanding, are particularly attended to. The authors of this article find that a dialogue which develops the ideas, key concepts, analyses and actions of Gandhi and Freire (within contemporary settings, and with appropriate learning processes) provides a fruitful basis for a peace studies or peace education program.

GANDHI AND FREIRE ON CAMPUS: THEORY AND PRACTICE IN TERTIARY PEACE STUDIES PROGRAMS

Robin Burns
Graduate School of Education

Thomas Weber
School of Law and Legal Studies

La Trobe University
Bundoora, Victoria
Australia

Over the past twenty years, the formal study of peace at universities and colleges has become one of the burgeoning array of options available to students. Peace research has a longer history in universities, although it was often located in separate specialised institutes. Doctoral level studies were main options for students of peace. The teaching of peace studies at the undergraduate level has been more recent, growing especially in the last decade. In many instances, it has crept in as an option in existing disciplines, especially political science and international relations, and there has been a steady debate about the nature and content of peace studies as a distinct field of study. As professional associations became involved in nuclear concerns in particular, practitioners of other disciplines, such as anthropology, sociology and psychology, have also studied and taught peace issues. And peace education, which is arguably a different field to peace studies, has been included in some teacher education programs.

The development of formal peace studies programs is very diverse. Tertiary education is not known for attention to such curriculum details as rationale, theoretical base or selection of content, and the disciplines tend still to form the basis for much of undergraduate teaching. There are a variety of theoretical and ideological/philosophical approaches to peace, providing a great diversity of ways that courses can be structured. Further, peace studies has been controversial and considered by some conservatives in particular to not be a 'proper' field for university study, so that some programs have deliberately chosen more neutral descriptive titles. And given different disciplinary mixes in courses, and different ideas about content, the variety of offerings is huge. The Institute for World Order initiated curriculum guides in the early 1980s, now in a sixth edition, which

combine articles on the field with course outlines from many different countries and programs under the rubric 'Peace and World Order Studies'. However, how to develop a course which is theory-based, and to compare different theoretical orientations, has not been explored.

In this paper, we propose to take up that challenge. Each of us has been responsible for a peace studies program, one through taking on and transforming an existing interdisciplinary undergraduate course and the other through developing a peace education course within a graduate education program at the same university. The ideas which inspired each author will be presented, followed by the background to each course. The question is then asked: is peace so heterogeneous that it requires a single theoretical base in order to give it coherence, especially to provide a framework for considering issues, ideas and actual social phenomena? Taking Paulo Freire and Mahatma Gandhi, whose work for justice and social change has been outstanding, and whose writings provide a rationale for peace action and peace theory today, we explore how their philosophy in action can be translated into a coherent peace studies program, in the light of the courses we have developed.

GANDHI AND FREIRE: THEIR IDEAS

Revolutions are concrete historical phenomena. And revolutionary prophets, however utopian their vision, exist in time and particular places, and must speak to their audiences in words and word-pictures that can be shared. Beyond that, there are of course the great revolutionaries for whose vision followers claim a universal application, at least until the revolution is completed. Arguably only religious leaders fall into this category. However, while the capitalist state has not withered away, although it has changed in some profound ways, so maybe one could also claim such status for Marx. And others? Without getting into a debate about models for change, and the finer distinctions between revolution, transformation and reform, how do we name and locate those who offer a diagnosis and an example of how to work for change? The two whose philosophy, work and followers' applications are discussed here, Mahatma Gandhi and Paulo Freire, have the appearance of revolutionaries, speaking in particular historical and social contexts yet, it is argued, advocating approaches to change, methodologies that can be constructed from their words, which can be applied to different

specific situations. It is of note that each has a non-western genesis, and in fact has been an integral part of resistance to colonial rule and neo-colonialism. While Gandhi's aims were clearly revolutionary, within the analysis Freire offers he only discusses revolution very generally, though his ideas have been taken up as the basis for development of new practice aimed at change within different settings. Perhaps most noteworthy is that both have been teachers, have shown by example and worked with people in fundamentally educational ways, in order to communicate with the many (see Zachariah, 1986).

Gandhi and Freire are known for their work with the dispossessed, and their representations and interpretations of those people's plight and action to change it. Energising the dispossessed to speak and act for themselves is a major feature of the methods each has used. Is it but an empty exercise to keep alive the revolutionary myth, in the face of limited concrete change, to look at the underlying ideas of each and see how their study at the level of university might be legitimated? Do they provide both intellectual coherence and social, cultural, political and personal perspectives that will on the one hand satisfy academic criteria for valid knowledge-gaining activities within the ambit of academe in the late twentieth century, and on the other, provide opportunities for students and their teachers to work on common projects in the spirit of the perspectives, objectives and methods that are integral to the philosophy of Gandhi or Freire? In the spirit of each, we invite our audience to decide.

The authors have been profoundly influenced by either Gandhi or Freire. And each has attempted to introduce the ideas into peace courses – on the one hand, undergraduate peace studies, which originally had begun with quite a different perspective, and on the other, peace education within teacher education programs where the approach was implicitly attempting to implement the ideas as an integral part of course development. In this paper we look at the ideas of Gandhi and Freire, and at the courses in which the ideas have been developed, with particular reference to the peace studies/education programs that each author instigated.

Gandhi

Gandhi's personal and political campaign centred around the concept of *swaraj* – liberation – (lit. 'self-rule') at both the national and, more importantly, at the level of the individual. In the social realm the goal was

sarvodaya – the welfare of all – (rather than the good of the majority) and the tool of struggle to achieve this was *satyagraha* – active nonviolence. While it has at times been argued that the world view on which this program was based is essentially eastern, it has strong parallels in western existential philosophy and is clearly echoed in recent developments in the fields that have become known as the 'new physics' and 'deep ecology'. And in the field of grass-roots political activism, Gandhi is now often looked to for occasionally strategic, but more often tactical, guidance.

The cultural, historical and personal context

The life story of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi is too well known for it to be told yet again. And since the advent of Attenborough's movie ("the movie that became a movement") this is doubly true. As a major actor on the Twentieth Century world stage, Gandhi is remembered as the father of the Indian nation and as the "Mahatma" ("Great Soul") who shook the foundations of the British empire with his method of nonviolent resistance. It needs to be made clear that the driving force behind this activity on the political stage was to a large extent spiritual. True freedom was the freedom that came from within, from the dignity that grew out of fearlessness and sincerity to the self, from an absence towards others of either malice or exploitation, and from always acting "with a pure mind" (Gandhi, 1968b, p. 34). In short, the quest for ultimate truth was the foundation of the life worth living. And violence frustrated this quest for both the victim and perpetrator.

For Gandhi the call to action stems less from the deductive formula: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you", but rather from the statement of faith that "what in fact you do to others, you also do to yourself" (Naess, 1965, pp. 28-33; 1974, p. 54). The belief in the possibility of changing and perfecting the self, a possibility open equally to all, means that for him the choice of an individual is a choice for humanity because the self and humanity (and perhaps even all life) are ultimately one (Weber, 1991, pp. 138-139). Existentially, this makes nonviolence an imperative. The following quotation from Gandhi, while originally said in a political context, serves equally well to illustrate his philosophy of personal meaning.

> The so called master may lash you and try to force you to serve him. You will say, "No, I will not serve you for your money or under a threat." This may mean suffering. Your readiness to suffer will light

> the torch of freedom which can never be put out. (Gandhi, *Harijan*, 24 February, 1946.)

The freedom he spoke of was the freedom of the Indian nation from under the British yoke, but it can just as validly be read to mean the existential freedom that comes with the dignity of being one's own person, of making a commitment to live ethically, of standing up to the dictates of one's psychological masters and pressures to conform. In this sense Gandhi's philosophy in action was 'mainly educative', helping to train the soul and develop character so as to aid in the quest for true freedom; for the Truth.

Gandhian thought and the position of the individual

Gandhi's firm belief that by changing individuals one can change the world can be seen as being at odds with the modern sociological tradition which emphasises the 'priority' of society, and views individuals as the product of the social order. For Gandhi the individual preceded society – social structures derived from the qualities of the individual.

As leading Gandhian scholar Raghavan Iyer points out, "Gandhi refused to believe...that society is governed by laws of growth which are beyond the ability of any individual to alter" (Iyer, 1973, p. 117). At the heart of his philosophy of personal and social action "lay an insistence that individual will and reason can effect social and political change" (Bondurant, 1967, p. 118). In fact Iyer goes as far as to accept that Gandhi developed his concept of truth "in an effort to undermine external authority and to reaffirm the moral autonomy and authority of the individual as an agent and an active performer in the arena and politics and social life" (Iyer, 1973, p. 173).

Early Christian thought emphasised the belief that changes in society could be effected if individuals were changed, and Hindu thought allows for the existence of the truly free being, the *jivanmukta*, who has abolished, or transcended, all conditioning. The sociological anti-thesis to this is that individuals are strongly held by their social conditioning and only change as social conditions change. According to Prasad, Gandhi realised that under the original thesis great individuals could come forth while society degenerated, while under the revised thesis society could be enriched while individuals lost their freedom (Prasad, 1958, p. 149). Gandhi's social philosophy encompassed both an enriched society and free individuals. Chan-

ges in social conditions are dependent on changes in the hearts of individuals. This does not happen through the inevitability of progressive historical change – persons must consciously, individually as well as eventually collectively, endeavour to bring about changes in their own lives and surroundings. Gandhi claimed that not only did people change society but that they had to take an active stance to ensure that this occurred. The responsibility for the state of society rests personally with each individual. To this end Gandhi led mass movements that were concerned with social injustice.

Self-reformation cannot come about in isolation, selflessness is a key to its attainment. Reformation of society and the self are inextricably linked – reform yourself and you have started to reform the world, reform the world nonviolently and you will have reformed yourself. This interplay between the individual and society can be seen when Gandhi speaks of the attainment of *swaraj* for India. He announces that once individuals stop regarding themselves as slaves they cease to be slaves; "...if we become free, India is free... It is Swaraj when we learn to rule ourselves. It is, therefore, in the palm of our hands...such Swaraj has to be experienced each for himself" (Gandhi, 1939, p. 65).

Satyagraha and pedagogy

Gandhi's technique for fighting the good fight is known by its Indian name of *satyagraha* (usually translated as "holding firmly to truth"). It means, in effect, the discovery of truth and working steadily towards it, hopefully converting the opponent into a friend. It is not used against anybody (there are no enemies, only opponents) but is done *with* somebody. "It is based on the idea that the moral appeal to the heart or conscience is... more effective than an appeal based on threat or bodily pain or violence" (Kumarappa, 1961, p.iii). Satyagraha, in short, is more than a method of conflict resolution that lends itself easily to scientific analysis. In fact it represents an ethical system that places heavy emphasis on the quality of the relationship between individuals. The aim is to liquidate antagonisms, not the antagonists themselves.

In the Gandhian scheme, the definition of violence is very wide. It includes the treatment of another with less dignity than a shared humanity warrants. In short, not only does dehumanisation pave the way for violence as war historians often tell us, but dehumanisation *is* violence. Violence in relationships is characterised as relating to another as a thing, relating, to borrow Martin Buber's phrases, as "I – It" rather than "I – You". Others

must always be treated as valuable ends in themselves rather than as mere means for our benefit. Violence and injustice are committed against others to the extent that they are not regarded as fully human. The refusal to use violence indicates a respect for both the personality and moral integrity of an opponent. It aims at establishing a realisation of an existing mutually shared humanity. Satyagraha aims at creating the conditions necessary for a Buberian dialogue. But this in turn requires a sense of personal worth and equality, fearlessness, of inner freedom.

For Gandhi, the emphasis on nonviolence did not mean the non-resistance to evil of many pacifist sects or mere passive resistance in situations of oppression. Satyagraha demanded positive action in the form of active promotion of good and the active prevention of evil. But Gandhi, the architect of the dismantling of the mightiest colonial empire ever known, could not believe in violence as a viable mechanism for political action. Ends never justified means, they always grew out of them. Violence could not build relationships or provide the type of dignity that fully-lived life required. Sartre and Fanon saw violence as a "cleansing force" which provided dignity and restored self-respect when the oppressed rose up against their oppressors (Fanon, 1967, pp. 8, 94). Gandhi too saw the need for self-respect, going so far as to say that "where there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence". The crux of Gandhi's message was that these are generally *not* the only two alternatives; there is also nonviolence which "affords the fullest protection to one's self-respect and sense of honour" (see Weber, 1991, pp. 48-49).

Violence to persons and property has the effect of clouding the real issues involved in a conflict while (ideally) non-coercive, nonviolent action invites the conflicting parties to a dialogue about the issues themselves. Where this fails to bring about conversion in the first instance (of either party – Gandhians must always remain open to the possibility that truth lies with the opponent), it may still do so through the agency of third parties. If one endures suffering for a cause without inflicting it on an opponent, the opponent may be converted indirectly if public opinion, or the opinion of those in a position of close social relationship to the opponent, is moved to the side of the nonviolent activist. A life that is incongruent – lived in a way that is contradictory to conscience, or totally out of step with the beliefs of third parties in a close social relationship – can become existentially dysfunctional at some stage and will force conversional change in individual behaviour (see Weber, 1993). Here was the nonviolent technique of the

good fight, and given that the fulfilment of human potential was the aim of life, oppression in all its form was the focus of the battle.

The Constructive Programme

Something that may be categorised as 'peacebuilding' also played a significant part in the Gandhian vision (Weber, in press). Gandhi held before himself, and attempted to place before the masses, a picture of an ideal society that was to be the goal of collective endeavour as the approach towards 'Truth' was to be goal for the individual. This vision of a sarvodaya social order was summed up in the word "Ramrajya", the "Kingdom of God", where there were equal rights for princes and paupers, where even the lowliest person could get swift justice without elaborate and costly procedures, where inequalities which allowed some to roll in riches while the masses did not have enough to eat were abolished, and where sovereignty of the people was based on pure moral authority rather than power.

Gandhi firmly believed that all forms of exploitation and oppression rest to a large degree on the acquiescence of the victims. With this in mind he noted that "exploitation of the poor can be extinguished not by effecting the destruction of a few millionaires, but by removing the ignorance of the poor and teaching them to non-cooperate with the exploiters" (Gandhi, *Harijan*, 28 July 1940). It was partly for the educative purpose of pointing this out to the oppressed that Gandhi instituted what he called the "Constructive Programme". This Constructive Programme was originally part of the struggle to obtain India's independence. It involved future leaders in the struggle and put them in contact with the masses (it is not enough to work *for* people, they must be worked *with*: Gregg, 1941, p. 13) as well as helping to bring about the society Gandhi envisaged free India as being. In fact, Gandhi claimed that the wholesale fulfilment of the Constructive Programme "*is* complete Independence", because if the nation was involved in the very process of rebuilding itself in the image of its dreams "from the very bottom upwards" it would by definition be free (Gandhi, 1968a, p. 335).

The program, in its original context, dealt mainly with the problems of communal unity, the removal of untouchability, the uplift of women, the re-establishment of village industries, village sanitation, prohibition, adult education and basic education for all, the promotion of a national language, education in health and hygiene, and work towards economic equality. (This list makes it apparent that the Constructive Programme is different to

Peacecorps type of technical assistance work that aims to tackle the "problems" caused by "underdevelopment". Here, rather, the emphasis is on "uplift"). This aimed at producing "something beneficial to the community, especially to the poor and unemployed" and provided "the kind of work which the poor and unemployed can themselves do and thus self-respectingly help themselves" (Gregg, 1941, p. 5).

For Gandhi this constructive work offered replacement for what the nationalists were opposing at the very time they were opposing it. Without it, satyagraha in the form of civil disobedience, if it succeeded in overthrowing the imperialist rulers, would merely exchange one group of leaders for another resulting in "English rule without the Englishmen... the tiger's nature, but not the tiger..." (Gandhi, 1939, p. 30).

In situations of social conflict and mass campaigns of civil disobedience Gandhi made it a point to couple constructive work to civil disobedience, sometimes seeming to say that constructive work was an aid to the civil disobedience campaign and at other times putting the formula around the other way. Civil disobedience, he claimed, was capable of use as a technique for the redressing of local wrongs or in order to rouse local consciousness or conscience, alone however it could never be used in a general cause such as, for example, a struggle for independence. For a civil disobedience campaign to be effective "the issue must be definite and capable of being clearly understood and within the power of the opponent to yield" (Gandhi, 1968a, p. 369). It could however be used to assist a "constructive effort" in such a case. Where a campaign is focussed on local issues, or on the winning of specific concessions, no elaborate constructive program is necessary; but where the issue revolves around structural problems, civil disobedience without it becomes "mere bravado and worse than useless" (Gandhi, 1968a, p. 370), perhaps toppling individuals from the elite but doing nothing about entrenched systems of oppression. Constructive work, in other words, becomes a key weapon in the undertaking of large and general nonviolent campaigns, and perhaps such campaigns are not fully nonviolent unless accompanied by some kind of constructive activity.

There is however more to constructive work than the objectively "socially useful and brotherly" (Gregg, 1941, p. 5) aspects of technical assistance. It also has a subjective side: furnishing a discipline for non-violence. Gandhi made the point that "the best preparation for, and even the expression of, non-violence lies, in the determined pursuit of the Constructive Programme. Anyone who believes that, without the backing of the con-

structive programme he will show non-violent strength when the testing time comes, will fail miserably" (Gandhi, *Harijan*, 12 April 1942).

After Gandhi settled on the terminology for his form of nonviolent resistance he took pains to distinguish satyagraha from passive resistance which he saw as inaction, often stemming from weakness. He explained that the nonviolence of his conception actively sought to prevent violence and right wrongs. Constructive work provided the discipline as well as a method for tackling major problems of structural violence that require the long-term approach of peacebuilding.

Gandhi knew that political freedom was easier to achieve than economic, social and moral freedom because the work for the latter, being constructive, was "less exciting and not spectacular" (Gandhi, 1968a, p. 372). As Gandhi was setting off for London for talks with the British, following the political turmoil of the 1930 Salt Satyagraha, he stated that "...the work of social reform or self-purification...is a hundred times dearer to me than what is called purely political work" (Gandhi, *Young India*, 6 August 1931). During the Second World War, a time when many Indians wanted to push ahead with civil disobedience, Gandhi stated that "Those... who wish to see India realize her destiny through non-violence should devote every ounce of their energy towards the fulfilment of the constructive programme in right earnest without any thought of civil disobedience" (Gandhi, *Harijan*, 1 June 1940), and soon thereafter confessed that "In placing civil disobedience before constructive work I was wrong. I feared that I should estrange co-workers and so carried on with imperfect Ahimsa (nonviolence)" (Gandhi, *Harijan*, 21 July 1940).

Freire

Paulo Freire is a critic of colonialism, of the situation in Latin America, especially Brazil, in the post-colonial period, and of the processes of social and political change. He is also a critic of education. His own work has concentrated on the development of an educational philosophy and practice to enable oppressed people, whose culture and very being, including consciousness, is dominated by others, to become active agents in reclaiming their 'voice' and participating in shaping change. There are three major elements in his underlying analysis: a concept of the nature of the human being, the relationship of human beings with the world both ideally and as it is distorted through oppressive political structures, and a theory of

knowledge. Through linking these three, he suggests a pedagogical practice based on dialogue between learners and educator as active Subjects in the process of knowledge creation.

The cultural, historical and personal context

Since Freire as a person is less well known than Gandhi, despite his considerable travels during the 1970s, a sketch is given, before looking more closely at his ideas and practice.

Paulo Freire was Secretary of Education and General Coordinator of the National Plan of Adult Literacy in Brazil before the military coup in 1964 forced him into exile. He went next to Chile, working at the university and as consultant to the UNESCO Institute of Research and Training in Agrarian Reform, then to the US as Visiting Professor at the Harvard Center for Studies in Education and Development, and from there to the Office of Education at the World Council of Churches in Geneva. He returned to Brazil in June 1980 and became Minister for Education. Born in 1921, "in his childhood he was often hungry. His youthful experiences led him to develop a sympathy with the oppressed and a revolutionary conviction" (White, 1973, p. 19), though his family was middle class. His testing ground was the change in Brazil during the 1950s and early 1960s, as it moved from a closed society, towards a homogeneously open society. In the transition,

> ...elite and masses alike lacked integration with Brazilian reality. The elite lived "superimposed" upon that reality; the people, submerged within it. To the elite fell the task of importing alien cultural models; to the people, the task of following, of being *under*, of being ruled by the elite, of having no tasks of their own. (Freire, 1976, p. 8.)

And in the transitional phase he considered that education was a highly important task. In particular, it could enhance people's capacity to participate in the transitional epoch and hence help shape the future.

Freire's writings are extensive. Those in translation cover his philosophy, his educational practice, and more recently, some extended dialogues with long-standing colleagues from different countries. His ideas change over time, at least in detail, though he says that one should not disown one's earlier work (Goulet, 1976, p. vii). Further, translations of his work in English did not appear in chronological order, and in fact for many westerners, the two books which both appeared in 1972, *Cultural Action*

for Freedom (first published in Portuguese in 1967) and *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970 Portuguese version), are his main, if not only, works. In the account that follows, the ideas are not presented chronologically nor discussed developmentally; rather, the key elements of his approach are considered.

The human being as an active participant in history

Freire was centrally concerned with and committed to change. While he considers that change is an essential part of all social and cultural life, at some points in history, and in some places, the requirement is for revolutionary change. Countries emerging from colonialism and from non-democratic regimes call for a revolution, for example in his own environment in Latin America, especially Brazil.

Much of his reflective writing is about the relationships between the means for and the ends of change. The examples he works through relate mostly to the area of education with which he had most concrete experience, that of adult literacy teaching. It was here, where method or technique could be seen easily as the only elements for successful learning, that his educational ideas were forged. Here was a unique opportunity not just to teach illiterate peasants to read and write, but to involve them, and the teachers as well, in cultural action for freedom (Freire, 1972a, p. 11). The peasants could learn to read and write; they and their teachers would also learn from each other, would discuss and reflect on their views of the world, and work together for change. This dialectical relationship, as Freire saw it, between reflection and action, is an act of knowing, a conscious act that is a unique capacity of human beings.

His starting point for both thought and practice is with concepts of persons and the world. The human being is unique, existing both "*in* and *with* the world.... Men can fulfil the necessary condition of being *with* the world because they are able to gain objective distance from it" (Freire, 1972a, p. 51). The capacity for objectivity, including objectification of oneself, is necessary in order to have both knowledge of the world, and self-knowledge. These capacities in turn allow for reflection on life and for questions regarding the nature of one's relationship with the world. Reflection is critical because: "Only beings who can reflect upon the fact that they are determined are capable of freeing themselves" (Freire, 1972a, p. 52). Through reflection human beings attain consciousness, which is always "consciousness *of* something. Hence the condition of the human being is to

be in constant relationship to the world" (Freire, 1976, p. 144). Acting, reflecting, conscious Subjects are thus relational beings, capable of independent thought and action. They orient themselves in the world through thought-language (he rejects a duality of language and thought). However, the very conditions which constitute thought-language can come to suppress or distort the capacity for critical consciousness when they are imposed on groups from outside, by those with different central interests.

Indeed, the very vocation of all people, to be human, can also be seen as "man's central problem" (Freire, 1972b, p. 20), since it can be distorted: both domination and being dominated suppress this possibility. Colonial cultures are dominating ones, giving rise to alienating cultures in the places where they dominate; however, both dominator and dominated cultures may also dominate internally, when the interests, and the very language of the elite, is different to that of the masses. Under these circumstances, the masses are alienated from their own culture, most seriously in Freire's terms, because "reality as it is thought does not correspond to the reality being lived objectively" (Freire, 1972a, p. 14). The effect of this language-thought alienation is to establish and maintain the culture of the oppressed as a "culture of silence", whether the whole culture is silenced or in "the silent sectors of cultures which prescribe their voice" (Freire, 1972a, p. 18). The struggle for people is to find their own voice. And it is not just in former colonies where silencing takes place: he illustrates this with the upsurge of popular 'minority' social movements such as women's liberation, gay liberation, ecological movements and racial minority movements (Freire & Faundez, 1989, p. 65). Further, education itself, if it merely imposes an alien knowledge on learners, is domesticating, maintaining dependence and passivity. This can happen in any educational setting.

Conscientisation and pedagogy

For Freire, educational practice is based on these concepts of what it is to be human, and the creation of learning situations which free human consciousness and ability to know authentically. Further, the process of education is a social and cultural one, not just the awakening of the individual's consciousness. Education is learning to participate in problem-solving to create a more just society. Literacy is not an option for Freire, but a critical tool for political awakening and participation in change.

The terms of his pedagogical theory and practice arise from his adult literacy work. If, as he states, the learning of literacy is to be "for man, it

must be based on learning as an act of knowing, and not mere memorisation" (Freire, 1972a, p. 13). After he worked in more diverse situations, he extended the concept to one of education for political literacy. Literacy he uses in this sense metaphorically, emphasising rather the political nature of education for conscientisation. Such education enables human beings to "participate critically in a transforming act", through dialogue. In this, we recognise that the world is not given, but is "a world dynamically 'in the making'" (Freire, 1985, p. 106).

In order to find a voice and break out of the culture of silence, 'conscientisation' must take place. This is "first of all the effort to enlighten men about the obstacles preventing them from a clear perception of reality" (Freire, 1972a, pp. 81-82). Conscientisation is a cultural action, in a concrete time and place, using the material of people's lives as the basis for change. However, whether cultural action leads to freedom or repression depends on the ability of the oppressed to critically understand the reality of oppression and its formative influence on the way they perceive their situation. Freire's writings wrestle with the nature of cultural action, oppression, consciousness and the possibility for people to rid themselves of the internalised view of themselves and their situation that comes from dependence. Critics, such as the sociologist Peter Berger, were quick to point out that Freire's view denied the efficacy of people's 'unconscientised' reality and raised questions about "whose consciousness is being raised, and by whom?" (Berger, 1975, p. 2). In his concept of the relationship between educator and 'educatee', his concern that education is a joint venture that starts with the learners' reality, and his analysis of the processes which distort the perceptions of oppressed or dependent people, Freire implicitly answers such concerns. Attention is drawn to the importance of the pedagogical process and not just the content of education.

For the pedagogical process to enable human beings to participate as active, conscious subjects, the relationship between learners and educators is critical. Throughout his work there is a critique of education for domestication, which is based on a 'banking' notion whereby the expert-educator deposits chosen amounts of knowledge into passive learners, whose task is to remember and reproduce the selected 'facts'. Education for liberation, on the other hand, is humanising. Rather than conditioning people to the status quo, it de-conditions through the process of asking questions (Freire, 1972a, p. 9). De-conditioning involves a relationship of dialogue between learners and educators in which the learners are invited to think and to

critically reflect on their reality in order, together, to transform it. The dialogue begins with the making of an educational program together, and Freire developed culture circles as a way of doing this. These circles preceded literacy work, as a preparation for wanting to learn to read.

> Only dialogue, which requires critical thinking, is also capable of generating critical thinking. Without dialogue there is no communication, and without communication, there can be no true education. (Freire, 1972b, p. 65.)

Learning is also a creative activity (Freire, 1978, p. 4), since knowing is a human act. To enable this to happen, the educator needs to be open to the learners and their reality, thus learning with them. In particular, educators and leaders must not use education to impose their vision of the future on the masses. Rather:

> The question I have to ask myself again and again is this: in company with whom do I translate my vision into reality ...if I work *on* and not *with* the people, I contradict my revolutionary words about the creation of a just society. (Freire & Faundez, 1989, p. 55.)

And learning is a social activity. This makes it possible for conscientisation to transcend individual self-preoccupation and through dialogue, establish co-operation in the revolutionary task of transformation (Freire, 1972b, p. 136).

Dialogue leads to action, and it is also essential in order for learning to take place. It is the practice which links learners and educator; their task is to name reality, in order to change it. Educators ('coordinators' in the literacy programs) have particular skills, but they will only be effective if they are communicating with the learners and open to the knowledge which the learners bring to the situation that both are exploring.

People – learners and educators – are linked to the external, objective world through the process of knowing. Knowing is an act which takes place between people, mediated by objects which can be known, and employing dialogue as "a fundamental part of the structure of knowledge". In other words, the class is "a meeting-place where knowledge is sought and not where it is transmitted" (Freire, 1976, p. 148). To seek knowledge is to "move towards a new way of thinking in both educator and educatee, through the dialogical relationships between both". Learning is also problem-posing: "discovery originates in the attempt to solve a problem."

(Freire, 1976, p. 123). In his extended conversation with the Chilean philosopher Antonio Faundez, published in English as *Learning to Question*, he says:

> Human existence, because it came into being through asking questions, is at the root of change in the world. There is a radical element to existence, which is the radical act of asking questions...
>
> At root human existence involves surprise, questioning and risk. And, because of all this, it involves action and change. (Freire & Faundez, 1989, p.40.)

Justice, Development, Peace...

The reader can sometimes become lost in Freire's words and analyses of 'man and world', knowledge, pedagogy, consciousness and revolutionary praxis. His vision of a just society is rarely given much conscious shape, because of his belief that it is something which people make, together. Precisely because reality is constantly being remade, conscientisation is necessary in order to involve people, consciously, in the process of transformation.

> The fundamental role of those committed to cultural action for conscientization is not properly speaking to fabricate the liberating idea, but to invite the people to grasp with their minds the truth of their reality (Freire, 1972a, p. 76.)

It is in the critique of oppression and dependency that we find both a basis for action, and also for understanding reality, as it is and as it can be changed. Throughout the analysis and critique of colonialism, Freire's central ideas about oppression emerge. These tend to subsume the alternatives, justice and development, in the historical context of the Third World in the 1960s and 1970s. He makes reference to a just society, and to development. His concern is for cultural development, not technical, non-liberating development or economic development which oppresses the majority of the people. And in common with other revolutionary thinkers, his concept of liberation is overwhelmingly idealistic, based in the potential for human action which is 'authentic', not formed by the dictates of oppressive others. He suggests his work is located in concrete situations as well as in the books and abstract ideas, and he extends an invitation to dialogue with him, "to enter into reality so that, knowing it better, [he] can better transform it" (Freire, 1972b, p. 18). He shows us a practice, edu-

cation, which can enable people to create more just structures and to participate in development, rather than being the passive objects of predominantly technical change.

A just society, it could be said, is one in which development, like literacy, is forged *with* the people. He does not linger on the lack of development, but rather on the exercise of power which tragically divides people into oppressor and oppressed. Thus, he maintains that the concrete reality of Latin America, during the period of change from a dependent colonial society, required two interlinked process. The first was the handing over of power, while the second was a transformation of consciousness, because dependence is "a relational phenomenon which gives rise to different forms of being, of thinking, of expression, those of the 'culture of silence' and those of the culture which 'has a voice'." His over-riding concern has been with the process of human liberation, and more specifically, "the democratization of culture, within the context of fundamental democratization" (Freire, 1976, p. 41). The pre-democratic situation is one of domination, exploitation and oppression, and every such relationship, he considers,

> ...is by definition violent, whether or not the violence is expressed by drastic means. In such a relationship, dominant and dominated alike are reduced to things – the former dehumanized by an excess of power, the latter by lack of it. And things cannot love. When the oppressed legitimately rise up against their oppressor, however, it is they who are usually labelled 'violent', 'barbaric', 'inhuman', and 'cold'. (Among the innumerable rights claimed by the dominating consciousness is the right to define violence, and to locate it. Oppressors never see themselves as violent.) (Freire, 1976, p. 10, footnote 9.)

The concept which may provide a key link between Freire and Gandhi, therefore, is violence. He has spoken about the fact that the moral-ethical dimension of violence is a strategic or tactical one, referring to Thomas Aquinas and the concept of the 'right to revolution'. His personal preference is for the solution of social conflicts "through dialogue, because I love the life with flowers and birds. But unfortunately, it is not like that this century" (Freire, 1974). Violence for him is something that happens in everyday life in certain situations, even though its origins may be supranational. It is engendered in oppressors as a result of an unjust order (Freire, 1972b, p. 21). He writes little about physical violence, though it is clear that he sees its use as one way in which the oppressors can maintain

their power, and maybe the only way the oppressed can protest in some situations. It is the situation of domination and the consequent consciousness of the oppressors that gives rise to violence. As a result, the oppressors cannot bring about their own liberation. However, he admits intellectuals, who are radicalised, into the fold of liberators, and it is their duty, "imposed by love itself, to react against the violence of those who try to silence [them]" (Freire, 1976, p. 10). But above all, it is "the great humanistic and historical task of the oppressed to liberate themselves and their oppressors as well" (Freire, 1972b, p. 21). He talks about the "struggle" and "fight" for liberation, based on his diagnosis of oppression as violent, but he wants to ensure that the achievement of freedom is not in itself oppressive. Freedom is achieved by "conquest" (Freire, 1972b, p. 24) and social transformation, which also involves the transformation of consciousness, but he avoids the issue of concrete means through talking about the fight for liberation as "an act of love" (Freire, 1972b, p. 22).

Thus, violence is central to his analysis and to his work, and his definition of violence points straight to structural violence, named in his terms as the 'culture of silence', which stresses the effects of the dominator-dominated relationship on culture and consciousness. It can be argued, therefore, that Freire is fundamentally concerned with change in order to transform the structured power relationships and the processes which maintain them. The political and economic mechanisms maintaining dependence, both within and between nations, he acknowledges, and in a taped discussion when he was in Australia in 1974, he spoke of the need to recognise the violent reactions of the oppressors, not just that of the oppressed. In so doing, he pointed again to the structural aspects, the violence in the system itself, and to Helder Camara's notion of institutionalised violence. He is part of the radical Latin American intellectuals, of whom the liberation theologians (Camara, 1971; Gutierrez, 1973) and the dependency theorists have become best known in the west (Bernstein, 1973; Frank, 1972; Cardoso & Faletto, 1979). Therefore he did not linger over violence, since his concern was to change the conditions which enable and support the underlying violent relationships. His focus, rather, was on democracy. And in order to achieve this, development is brought into the equation, at least economic development "as a support for democracy, thereby ending the oppressive power of the rich over the very poor. This development would necessarily be autonomous and national in character...but would also have to involve the passage from one mentality to another..." (Freire, 1976, p. 32).

FROM CAUSES TO COURSES

The vision of both Gandhi and Freire was revolutionary, centred on the achievement of a better, structurally nonviolent world. While the Gandhian vision may have been more insistent on eschewing direct violence in the efforts that had to be made to bring about the necessary transformation, both visions speak directly to the concerns of a broadly based tertiary peace studies program.

Peace studies courses that focus on war and war prevention generally have no strong theoretical thread that can be attributed to any particular thinker. They tend to include a token class or two in the introductory sessions on Freud or Lorenz as theorists of human aggression, and towards the end often include one on Gandhi the pacifist. However, programs that take on the expanded agenda of peace studies can benefit from the introduction of Mahatma Gandhi and Paulo Freire into the classroom. Where, primarily as a response to the work of Johan Galtung, the central issue has moved from direct violence and negative peace to the broader agenda of structural violence (Galtung, 1969; 1971) and its elimination (a shift that is increasingly appropriate since the end of the Cold War) the life and works of either or both of these revolutionary activists can serve as the basis for the construction of theoretically coherent courses.

Gandhi in the Classroom

Gandhi the nonviolent revolutionary was also an educator in a more direct sense than indicated above. In 1939, in a lull between his major campaigns for Indian independence, Gandhi laid the foundation for his system of basic national education, "Nai Talim" ("new education"). The aim was to educate children in a way that would prepare them in every aspect of the emerging national society. It sought to bring out the best in students, intellectually, physically and spiritually, in a way that would produce the citizens for the new order that the Mahatma hoped would emerge. The system was to draw out the hidden potential in students rather than putting information into them. The emphasis was on manual work, centring on a suitable craft which would have the added function of providing the salary of the teacher, rather than on literacy (see Patel, 1953; Sykes 1988), which Freire saw as central. In this way the labour essential for the functioning of a community would retain its dignity and a decentralised and self-sufficient polity could be

built.

Not only was Gandhi's education system not taken up in independent India, but even his modest educational experiment, in the village where he was based during the last two decades of his life, has faltered. In any case, his Nai Talim educational experiment was never going to be one that could provide the basis for peace education in western academic settings. But Gandhian education in the less direct sense has much to offer. In the universities Gandhi generally appeared in courses on Indian history and politics as a major political actor. Only after the resurgence of the peace movement during the early 1980s, and the ensuing expansion of peace studies courses at the tertiary level, did Gandhi the peace theorist and campaign organiser make his mark in any significant way in nonviolent training sessions for activists and in the university classroom.

Gandhi's chief educational disciple, Marjorie Sykes, has noted that peace education is now often thought of as another subject in a curriculum concerned with

> "putting in information" on relevant aspects of the international political and economic structure, such as the role of the UN, dangers of the nuclear arms race, and global tensions caused by poverty, hunger and injustice (Sykes, 1988, p. ii.)

She notes that information of this kind has its place, but only if it does not end up being something "mugged up" for an examination and then forgotten. "It comes alive," she continues,

> as a real part of peace education, only if it is related to an attitude of mind and spirit which is as relevant at the school level, at the village level, as at the international level – an attitude which says in effect: "there is no way to peace; *peace is the way*". Education for peace means learning to *live* peace, daily and hourly, wherever one happens to be, learning to tackle and resolve the tensions and conflicts of outlook and interest which are a necessary and valuable part of human experience. (Sykes, 1988, pp ii-iii.)

This questions whether, even if Gandhian ideas can form the basis of a coherent peace studies curriculum, a method of imparting this knowledge in a way where the medium can become part of the message is practical or desirable in the university setting.

It is not an overly great exaggeration to call Galtung the father of

modern peace research, and for those who have followed his career the influence of Gandhi is quite evident. But Gandhi was far more than a mere influence, the Mahatma was in a sense Galtung's entree into the world of peace research. We know that as a seventeen year old he 'cried bitterly' when he heard the news of the Mahatma's assassination and that one of the first jobs of the young mathematics and sociology student was as an assistant to the respected Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess, helping to prepare a series of lectures on Gandhi's political ethics, which was to result in their joint 1955 Norwegian publication *Gandhis Politiske Etikk*. Much of Galtung's section of that, his first book, was written in prison where he was serving time as a conscientious objector against military service. And his writings since have contained many references to the Mahatma and Gandhian philosophy. In fact, if one wishes to fully understand Galtung's peace research it is important to comprehend Galtung's understanding of Gandhi (and with Galtung's recent book, *The Way is the Goal: Gandhi Today*, this is now possible).

When Gandhi was still a major concern of the current preeminent theoretician of nonviolence, Gene Sharp, he prepared a document (presented as an appendix to his *Gandhi as a Political Strategist*) titled "Suggestions for Preparing Courses on Gandhi." In Australia there is a struggle to maintain even a handful of generalist peace studies courses – there is almost no possibility of mounting a course focussing more specifically on Gandhi or Gandhian thought. Nevertheless, Gandhi can be used as a unifying thread for general peace or development studies courses.

Sharp recommends (Sharp, 1979, p. 349) that before a Gandhi related course, that does not focus directly on the Mahatma, is set up, the subject or problem areas in which Gandhi appears relevant must be identified and then the group should be lead from those broader interests to specific aspects of Gandhi which would become the focus of study. He notes that at times nine-tenths of a course will be devoted to the broader field (social movements, international relations, revolution and social ethics are examples provided by Sharp) and at others up to a third of the course can be focussed on Gandhi.

Gandhi is taught in Indian History and Indian Politics subjects at La Trobe University. In its original form, in the narrowly focussed peace studies course taught here, there was one self-contained session on Gandhi (given by the person teaching Indian History) out of a total of twenty-six in the course.

Changes in times lead to changes in course contents. If the main focus of a course is no longer predominantly concerned with military balances and nuclear deterrence, Gandhi can supply the theoretical base that provides coherence. In any peace studies class that focuses on peace movements and civil disobedience the influence of the Mahatma looms large, and of course if nonviolent action is a feature of such a program then Gandhi becomes central. Even those who are sceptical about the academic rigour possible in courses with a nonviolence focus (often, Lopez points out, "with some of the most hostile reactions, in fact, coming from international relations faculty in peace programs") (Lopez, 1994, p. 8), must, since the overthrow of Marcos and the major upheavals in Eastern Europe, take nonviolence and nonviolent action seriously. Where economic development is stressed, Gandhi often makes an appearance through the writings of E.F. Schumacher. If the course concerns itself with environmental ethics or activism, through the example of the celebrated Indian tree-hugging Chipko movement (Weber, 1989), again Gandhi is often introduced. (Some years ago an outline of a course for high school history teachers, entitled "Gandhi, the Greenie: Gandhi, Environment and Possibilities for Curriculum" was developed by a Melbourne academic.) And if the course has an even broader peace agenda, as many now do, Johan Galtung, who was largely responsible for the expansion, generally becomes a key figure; and through him Gandhi.

Content

The Peace Studies course at La Trobe University was put together in 1987 and first taught in 1988. Students could major in Peace Studies by selecting a set number of units from a fairly restricted list of undergraduate subjects offered in various departments at the university. The major had to include the compulsory core peace studies subject within the list. The subjects on the list dealt in the main with questions of negative international peace: International Relations; Australia and War; Philosophy of War and Peace; War, Technology and Peace; International Economic Conflict; Human Rights; Theories of Development; and Conflict Management. Given the political climate of the time such a choice of subjects may not have been surprising. It would be fair to say that this was a typical peace studies offering of the time – during the Cold War the questions surrounding issues of Superpower conflict and the threat of nuclear war were understandably central.

This approach to content was also reflected in the core peace studies subject. Each of the twenty-six weeks of the course was a more or less self-contained session with different lecturers teaching various components. The sessions were grouped under five headings, each comprised of several lectures: *History of War and Peace* looked at the causes and effects of war; *Theory of War, Security and World Order* looked at ethological and psycho-analytical theories of war, at nationalism, balance of power, collective security, international law and disarmament; *Environmental and Technological Perspectives* focussed on weapons technology, the Strategic Defense Initiative ('star wars'), and nuclear winter; *Values and Peace* looked at holy war and just war doctrines, Christian attitudes to nuclear weapons, and Gandhian and Buddhist attitudes to war; and finally *War and Peace in the Arts* examined the portrayal of war and peace in literature, music, the cinema and painting. This list of offerings changed relatively little over the next four years although a section encompassing peace research, developments in peace theory and peace strategies was added. The course, taught by several lecturers, was an ad hoc introduction to various perspectives on the problem of war and negative peace. To a large degree it lacked a theoretical coherence and certainly there was no thread, whether Gandhian or other, of the type suggested by Sharp.

In 1992 the teaching and administration of the course became the responsibility of one person. By this time the international landscape had changed dramatically; it seemed an irrelevance to be lecturing on 'star wars'. The research interests of the new coordinator/lecturer centred around Gandhi and nonviolence theory. The core subject was radically revised to take account of issues that seemed more immediately relevant and that were more in line with his personal interests. Greater emphasis was placed on structural violence and positive peace, sections on nonviolence theory and feminist approaches to peace and violence were added, as were sections on peacekeeping (including attempts by the peace movement), peace campaigns and campaigners, civil disobedience and war tax resistance, environmental security, and conflict resolution (including a practical workshop). These changes were not entirely idiosyncratic. The 1994 edition of the authoritative curriculum guide to *Peace and World Order Studies* changed its name to *Peace and World Security Studies* (Klare, 1994) "in order to reflect the expansion of the field from a primary focus on peace and conflict issues to a broader sphere that encompasses other threats to human well-being and survival, including environmental degradation, persistent Third

World poverty, racial and gender violence, and political repression" (p. x).

At La Trobe, such changes were also reflected in the choices made available for students wishing to undertake a peace studies major. While some subjects that focussed on a particular war were deleted, overall the list of subjects from which students could choose was greatly expanded. Subjects dealing with development and underdevelopment, with peasant movements and revolutions, religion and society, environmental ethics and ecofeminism, the philosophy of love and hate and contemporary moral problems, Aboriginal/European relations, social movements and dispute resolution were added to the list of optional choices.

The course evolved into a whole comprised of four sections that aimed to move from the more theoretical to the more practical. The intent was to progress from an overview of the problems of violence, both direct and structural, that often caused feelings of despair among students, to a conclusion which left them with some optimism that they could act upon the world in order to change it for the better.

The first section, "Violence and War", examined varieties of violence, including human aggression and war. The second section, "Peace and Values", looked at Christian (and at times at Buddhist, Jain and Muslim) attitudes to war and violence, examined Gandhian satyagraha and nonviolence theory, as well as feminist analyses of war and violence. The next section, "Peace and Security", focussed on the international legal system, peace movement critiques and uses of it, peace movement critiques of, and alternatives to, United Nations peacekeeping, and looked at non-traditional approaches to the issue of security, including environmental security. The final section, "Peace Action", examined the work of peace activists and campaigns, discussed the issues of war tax resistance, conscientious objection, and the future directions for the peace movement. It included a conflict resolution workshop and a workshop with a leading peace activist. It concluded with students sharing the fruits of their research with their colleagues.

Process

Although the major, and more specifically the core course, still did not resemble the ideal Gandhian course of Sharp's vision, Gandhi and nonviolence became a far more consistent thread. This restructuring has raised the further question of how such material should be taught. When a subject consists of self-contained units without too clear a common theme, a lecture

by 'an expert' and an audience of learners is almost inevitable. The teacher has no time to get to know the students, to observe classroom dynamics and to facilitate longer term cooperative projects. These problems are, to a large degree, overcome when there is one person responsible for the course and when the course builds week by week around a recognisable theme. The issue now becomes one of whether a peace studies class, that focuses on the work of a particular person like Gandhi or Freire, can be taught in a way that is consistent with the process indicated by the chosen key figure – and whether from a tertiary standpoint this is desirable.

The class was run as a three hour combined seminar/lecture session. The last hour of the session (when the entire time was not taken up with a conflict resolution skills workshop or with free discussion with a leading peace activist) consisted of a general lecture, usually by the coordinator and occasionally by someone with particular expertise, devoted to the topic under consideration. The first two hours of the next session (following time, lengthy if necessary, for participants to report on peace related activities that they have been involved in or which have come to their notice) consisted of students presenting seminar papers to the class on more specific issues that flowed from the lecture, followed by discussion. This system encouraged classroom discussion and a collaborative and participatory learning experience for all, including the coordinator. After all, when the lecturer, wearing his other hat as a teacher in the Legal Studies program, enters a classroom to present a session on, for example, the law of homicide, with good cause he can be quite certain that none of his students know more about the area than he does. While he may know more about the life and thought of Gandhi than his students in the peace studies class, what can he tell a Vietnam veteran about combat, the women in the class about the structural violence inherent in a patriarchal society, or activists who have recently been laying down in front of bulldozers, paddling out to protest the arrival of visiting nuclear armed warships or been arrested for protesting outside (or inside for that matter) military bases about nonviolent action? In this setting knowledge cannot be a commodity monopolised by the educator.

As a result of early sessions on structural violence, participants were aware of the needs of all to the space that participation requires, were conscious of value biases in their language and felt little hesitation in recommending alternative topics that seemed more relevant to their understanding of a broadly based peace agenda. Students with similar interests were

encouraged to collaborate on their major research papers (one of which required the investigation of peace action – if possible a contemporary one allowing for 'field work' – in a way that examines the strategic goals and assesses the adequacy of the tactics chosen to achieve them).

This less hierarchical, less traditional form of teaching is more in keeping with the Gandhian current that runs through the course, and given that the research papers are of a sufficiently critical and scholarly standard, should cause no problem even within the relatively structured setting of the university classroom.

Freire in the Classroom

Freire is an educator, who considers that educators have a special contribution to the process of social transition. In his work to liberate the 'silent' and oppressed illiterate peasants through learning to read and write, he wanted them to name their world critically. This would free their consciousness of "the oppression which strangles them in their objective reality" (Freire, 1973, p. 4), because it is the internalised consciousness of the oppressor. However, in order to be liberating and not domesticating, such learning has to be wrought "*with*, not *for*, the oppressed". His peda- gogy takes oppression as the content for reflection, as a step towards engaging learners in the liberation struggle. In the process, the pedagogy itself is "made and remade" (Freire, 1972b, p. 25).

Freire's ideas were of great interest to radical educators in the late 1960s and 1970s, more for his critique of banking education than for his concern for the Third World. The latter concern found different audiences, in an emerging development education movement and amongst others who wanted to make major world problems the subject matter of education. Development educators began their work in non-formal settings but like peace educators, who were also influenced by Freire's ideas, some sought to introduce their material and practices into formal educational institutions, even universities, where they found small pockets of sympathetic academics.

Freire himself wrote about intellectuals, but rarely considered universities, and although he has spent some time in university departments in North America, his major work has always been in non-formal education. In his writings on Brazil he infers that change from a domesticating to a liberating education is possible in schools; after some time outside Brazil, he is more dubious. The reasons for this lie in his analysis of the nature of

the school, which as an instrument of the state is bound to serve the interests of the dominant groups. He also questioned dominant modes of knowing, transmitted in schools, a critique which is echoed by other radicals such as feminists. Dominant modes of knowledge production are challenged, which in turn calls into question some of the research findings and indeed the very possibility of 'objective' research (Burns & Haavelsrud, 1979; Haavelsrud, 1981a; Burns, 1981).

Freire has said that "experiments cannot be transplanted; they must be reinvented" (Freire, 1978, p. 9), thus rejecting attempts even to use his literacy 'method' without engaging critically and reflectively with the local situation and people. His message, rather than his method, is what he wanted to talk about, inviting his listeners to enter into a critical dialogue on his ideas about the nature of the educational process, with its essential critique of the social fabric and its embeddedness in a concept of human beings as "Subjects in the knowing process" (Freire, 1976, p. 153).

Freire's work became known outside Latin America as the western model of development was being questioned, at least in radical circles, and also as education was under scrutiny for its role in perpetuating privilege and inequality. In the words of an international student conference meeting to consider the role of students in development:

> ...students must be in the vanguard of the struggle for the complete elimination of poverty, hunger, disease, illiteracy and ignorance. In this struggle, public opinion must be mobilised through political action.
>
> We call for the reform of educational systems to promote a social consciousness among students... (Juelsminde Statement, 1968).

Could Freire's pedagogy become the basis for creating such change through education? Certainly it can be argued that one of the attractions of his social critique was its non-western origin, though he himself certainly drew heavily on western intellectuals, from Hegel and Marx to Gramsci. The upsurge of criticism of formal education, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, was often very similar to Freire's critique of the domesticating nature of education. But Freire's pedagogy was formed in adult literacy and agrarian work with Latin American peasants: could it a basis for change in formal education?

As noted above, his pedagogy and critiques were spread in the west largely through the development education movement. This in turn began

in some development assistance agencies, especially the Action for Development (AD) section of the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and its many contacts in aid agencies in Europe, Canada and Australasia. It was also spread in radical Christian circles from the World Council of Churches (WCC) in Geneva and Social Justice groups within the Roman Catholic church (Burns, 1979; 1983a).

Freire's ideas became a major theoretical underpinning for the development education movement. Based on key non-western thinkers such as Freire, development educators sought to avert yet another imposition on those countries from the 'west'. They advocated 'endogenous' development, and presented the west with some major challenges. These were directed at policies, both domestic in terms of resources, consumption, and minority groups, and external, especially trade, diplomacy and military activity. And underlying the challenges were concepts of oppression, domination and liberation. In this, the dependency theorists of Latin America, and their educational and theological allies such as Freire and Helder Camara, were central. Freire's diagnosis of oppression, Camara's conception of institutionalised violence, and the ideas of Frank, Freire and others about peripheries and marginalisation provided the framework for educational practice.

Although development education largely took place in non-formal settings, especially through new educational activities initiated by aid agencies, assessment of the potential in schools (Padrun, 1974) and universities (Burns, 1975) was initiated by AD, and national agencies tried to influence what was taught about development in schools and even universities. Such activity acquired legitimacy in name if not substance from the end of the first UN Development Decade report which recommended education in order to create the political will to move governments to increase their development assistance efforts (Pearson, 1970).

Universities teach about development issues. While the topic has remained largely within the discipline of economics, and sometimes politics or sociology, some interdisciplinary development studies courses, programs and research institutes began in the 1970s (Burns, 1975; 1979). And dependency theory, sometimes including Freire's writings, found its way into some development studies. Freire's ideas also appealed to another group, the Peace Education Commission (PEC) of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), and from its inception in 1972, Freire's central concepts were part of their debate about the nature of peace education. There

are other routes to peace education, and a major one which goes back several centuries links peace and international understanding, an approach to peace education which has by no means been ignored by PEC. However, the group that has played a key role within PEC adopted a Freirian basis for peace education in 1975 with their "global strategy for communication and consciousness-raising in various local settings" (Burns and Aspeslagh eds, in press). The emphasis has shifted in the content of peace education in the 1990s, although a recent major international publication by PEC members retains a strongly Freirian approach (Haavelsrud ed., 1993: the foreword is by Johan Galtung). With their emphasis on decolonisation, demystification and the construction of meaning in the local context, Freire's ideas also provide a bridge into postmodern thought.

Coming first to development education, which was inspired by participation in the 1968 World University Service/International Student Movement for the United Nations/International Medical Students' Association conference on the role of students in development, Burns offered short optional courses within teacher education at La Trobe University from the mid 1970s. A decade later, in 1984, she offered the first Australian peace education and development education course, at the School of Education at La Trobe, within the graduate Bachelor of Education program. It was a two term program, with the option for students to take a further one term course on teaching about other cultures in multicultural Australia to make a year long sequence (the BEd then consisted of 9 term-length courses, of which one had to be a three term sequence, which was considered as a 'major' field of study). The passage of the course through the university channels was not quite straight forward: the New Subject Review Committee questioned the interpretation of development (within education, it is usually means child development) and whether the substantive matters of peace and development would be studied as they are dealt with in the media, or in secondary schools – they did not refer to any theoretical work on either issue. And one professor of education worried about what he saw as the large scope of the course, while mentioning that he dealt with peace in one session of one of his courses.

Content

The course set out to deal with four areas: the identification, conceptualisation and interconnection of significant social issues; a survey of the ways in which they were treated in formal and non-formal educational

settings in selected countries; the generation of a framework for dealing with the different approaches based on a theory of knowledge, and the use of the framework to evaluating existing programs and development new ones. It thus combined substantive issues and educational ones. The rationale stated:

> Educational systems have come under increasing pressure to incorporate the study of so-called crucial social issues within the formal curriculum.... Two of these issues which have been a focus of concern are peace and development. Education for and about peace and development have run along separate lines in the past, but there is increasing convergence between them, brought about not only by the urgency of the nuclear threat, the increasing use of violence in society and the challenge of rising wealth and resources gaps, but by new theoretical understanding of the issues. The future is threatened not only by the possibility of nuclear holocaust, or an accelerated rate of social, especially technological change, but by the underlying structures of power and resource distribution which prevent people from understanding and acting within society in order to participate in change in ways which enhance their potentials and bring about greater realisation of their hopes. (Burns, 1983b.)

The first term focussed on concepts and approaches, beginning with wide-ranging discussion on social issues, how they are identified and by whom, whether the critical ones vary in different societies and cultures, and the process of reaching common understandings and priorities for action. Development and peace were then dealt with in some detail, and their interconnections explored using concepts such as justice, equality, structural violence and centre-periphery relations and the writings of Galtung, dependency theorists and liberation theologians. The next weeks were spent looking at the different ways to conceptualise the social role of education, radical critiques of education for domestication, and approaches to education about social issues which might be empowering for learners. Content and methodology were both examined, drawing heavily on the radical educators, and on the writings of Freire (1972a and 1972b) and Haavelsrud (1976, 1981a and 1981b). Social education in Australia was then critically reviewed. The second term turned to methodology and skill development. Topics covered ways in which the interests and concerns of learners could be used as starting points for the development of educational programs,

fairly directly based on Freire's notion on "generative themes" (Freire, 1978, pp. 49-52), the development of aims and their translation into classroom practice, a critique of some written curricula in order to refine skills of linking aims and approaches and asking questions about the hidden curriculum, a practical session of conflict resolution, an examination of the critiques of peace and development education which were being made publicly and attempts to respond to them, and a review of available resources.

The course was large in scope – potentially huge, covering the substantive issues, as well as how they are taught – and wrestled with an ongoing issue in teacher education: the balance between teaching content, especially with a group of students from diverse subject backgrounds, and focusing on pedagogical and curriculum aspects. The students were mature aged, and reflecting the intent of the whole BEd program, initially were almost all experienced secondary teachers. The clientele for BEd began to change in the mid-1980s, with many more primary teachers. There were other relevant changes too, inside and outside formal education, and with declining student numbers the course was changed in 1987 to 'The Contemporary World and the Classroom', a course of one semester duration which was largely about social issues and how they might be taught in schools. In 1988 it did not get the mandatory minimum enrolment of six, and has not been taught since. Peace education and development education was also offered in 1987 as an elective in the DipEd program, with the aim to introduce students to the ideas, issues and approaches to peace education and development education in six two-hour sessions.

Process

The La Trobe School of Education was established during the time of radical educational ferment, and incorporated some features in its programs, in particular small class sizes in order to maximise student participation and to offer a wide range of choice to students. A lecture format is only used for part of the pre-service DipEd course, seminars being the main approach. The only compulsory units are parts of the DipEd course, and at BEd level in particular diversity flourished with over 120 subjects on offer in the 1980s. Classes have been almost inevitably, therefore, both small (10-12) and diverse in terms of student mix. It is an ideal setting for participation and dialogue. Classes are all held from 5-8 pm, usually with a coffee break together, and as the students are mature professionals, they tend to need little encouragement to participate actively.

Freire and related theorists and practitioners, including members of PEC, inspired the content of this course, not only the social issues but the critiques of society and education and the pedagogical approaches. Burns' own pedagogical practice has been greatly influenced by his ideas, in particular using the reality of the learners as the starting point for a joint learning venture. This was not only advocated for use with school students, but in the university classroom as far as possible, although there are several major barriers to this. The first is that postgraduate students have had a very long period of being 'domesticated' by formal education, and have learnt to succeed in this system, as well as working in schools which also tend to impose it. They do not instantly respond to an invitation to make a program together – after all, they've come to university to 'be taught'. Secondly, of course, 'academic conventions' apply even in an initially radical School of Education, and while we were able to discuss and critique these as concrete data for understanding our situation and limitations, essays had to be produced which could be 'moderated' by other assessors. This was particularly difficult when students wished to explore an issue in an more open-ended and creative manner. While we talked about joint projects, and that option was available, none eventuated over the 4 years, and it is acknowledged that more time, encouragement and practice is needed to foster such work, which classroom teachers who were initiating cooperative programs in their classrooms were able to show us. The action component was limited to envisioning, and to discussion of actions in which class members had participated. We were able to discuss these difficulties in putting theory into practice. Students were invited to amend the program, both initially and weekly, the latter through asking at the start of each session if there were urgent issues the class wished to discuss, such as a world event, a conflict at school, or an action in which someone had participated, and also through checking at the end what would be the topic next week. Individuals were invited to take responsibility for facilitating sessions, e.g. finding someone to run the nonviolence skills workshop, introducing work in which they were involved, or asking for group problem-solving. The structural limitations, in our work together at university as well as students' work in schools, was often in focus.

An exercise was introduced in 1985 towards the end of the course, inspired by Elise Boulding's work on the future, in which each member made a wall chart depicting the expected, preferred and possible futures. These were discussed in detail in pairs, introduced to the class as a whole, and

used as the basis for group discussion about action to bridge the gap between the three. This proved to be a useful way to reflect on insights about the world and about action, and to use dialogue to 'invent' the future. It also put the task in the hands of the students, and solved what is often a tension even in problem-posing education, namely how to end a course which is dedicated to education as the process of leading out, without introducing not only pedagogical but intellectual closure in the form of the teacher's summary.

Lack of time and perhaps courage prevented more wholehearted attention to Freire's educational strategy. This would have involved the open-ended exploration of generative themes and the de-codification of individual participant's perceptions and constraints, problematisation, action and reflection. There was critique of society and education through examination of different perspectives on world problems and the ways in which we learn to deal with them, but not in the depth Freire envisages. And sometimes there was resistance, because of the pessimistic tenor of our analysis, especially of international events.

VISIONARIES AND ACADEMICS: A PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE?

Before returning to our opening challenge, the development of theory-based peace studies based on Gandhi and Freire, note should be taken that one author has used the term peace studies and the other uses peace education. Peace studies involve the academic consideration of the substance of peace based on research. They might also include the study of action, movements, policies, and work by different agencies, and indeed might include some ideas on the substantive issues from non-academic sources. However, they are firmly in the mould of academic work, even if the subject matter is sometimes controversial, and has been challenged conceptually especially from the international relations field (Lopez, 1989, p.13).

Peace education on the other hand, refers to "a more 'democratic' style of education" (Stephenson, 1989, p. 18) and to teaching about peace rather than peace research, whereas peace studies incorporates both research and teaching. Research results are included in peace education but are not the only substance of it. Similar issues come up in development studies versus development education, with development studies being primarily con-

cerned with third world development whereas development education calls into question both first world development and the relationships between the two.

Within the PEC-IPRA ambit, there has been a long-standing debate about the role of peace educators vis-à-vis peace researchers, stimulated by some peace researchers' concern that insufficient attention is given in peace education to content in general, and research findings in particular (e.g. Young, 1981). Educators stress the importance of process, not just for making research results digestible for particular audiences but, following Freire, for engaging the learners in deciding content. It is not, as has often been thought, that content is unimportant to peace educators, but who decides what is and what is not relevant content is problematised. The whole process of the generation, selection, organisation, transmission and evaluation of knowledge is relevant to particular educational outcomes, especially whether learners are empowered to reflect and act or merely required to regurgitate pre-determined information.

Action is a second issue which has some bearing on the questions both of appropriate nomenclature, and of whether or not Gandhi and Freire could provide the theoretical basis for a peace course at university. For Gandhi, action is central. Gandhi lead and encouraged peace actions, and peace activists still (and possibly increasingly) look to him for tactical guidance and for the theoretical underpinning on which to base their activities. And while highly motivated students in peace studies classes occasionally suggest that the group becomes collectively involved in some peace action (a sure way to have the course terminated by university authorities), experience suggests that these courses attract disproportionately large numbers of politically active students who, in turn, bring their experiences with them into the classroom. The feedback at La Trobe University suggests that such courses can be extremely important for many students at a deep personal level and the high quality of the research work indicates that academic rigour can be maintained. To some degree this is a function of the fact that such courses are traditionally self-selecting. They draw those with a bent towards activism rather than those whose primary concern is to put together a degree that will maximise their opportunities in the post university job market. It goes without saying that peace studies courses, even those not informed by Gandhian theory, will never be compulsory subjects for any degree.

For Freire, action is as essential as reflection. And while his literacy

groups did not necessarily move out of the classroom into the streets waving banners, if they had decided to do so in the course of learning to read (*favela* – slum – is an important generative theme for his literacy method), then he would no doubt have rejoiced. And people's action and the knowledge derived from critical reflection on our human consciousness of being-in-the-world is both the starting point of his educational work, and the goal of his desire for change through transformation. Action, and close association with activists, has been seen to bedevil peace studies and to be inappropriate and undesirable. However, as with the peace studies course, peace education attracted a high proportion of activist students and their experience enlivened the classes.

Freire's and Gandhi's ideas about how such study should take place are perhaps problematic for a formal educational institution. The approach to education as dialogue, in order to enable learners and educator to grasp the reality of a situation, and through reflection and action to transform it, is a pedagogical practice which can be instigated in any learning situation. Conscientisation involves the hard work of entering into and engaging with the learners' reality, to determine the generative or key themes in order to de-code. And action in the light of the new knowledge is integral, although Freire's work is not rich in examples of action. In part, learning to read in itself is to change one's way of acting in the world. And Gandhi's Constructive Programme is a concrete approach to change, one which has been partially implemented in various forms in school-work programs in a number of developing countries, including Guinea-Bissau when Freire was educational consultant to the post-independence government. Nevertheless, the reflection-action connection is not strong in most university education, and contemporary external university critics either denigrate reflection ('airy-fairy theory') or action (dangerously ideological). Freire had an answer to the latter in particular, when he emphasised time and again that there is no such thing as neutral education – it is either for the status quo or for change.

Combining Freirian and Quaker (and indeed Gandhian) ideas and practice, Bing shows how an experiential peace education program can be introduced at the tertiary level through a four-stage process. He points out that it is not a case of adding "what Lopez calls 'peace action' to 'peace research and theory'. It is rather the process of creating a curriculum where theory gives meaning to experience and experience in turn produces a reconsideration of theory" (Bing, 1989, p. 51). The approach he describes

is grounded in Freire's pedagogy, and in nonviolence as a basic principle, but is mindful of the need to integrate research, education and action, quoting Galtung's advice to this effect. This need is echoed by Alger (1989) in his description of the four 'crossroads' where peace studies should be located. Like Galtung, he is aware of the criticisms of peace work in universities where researchers and teachers are identified with peace action. This association tends to de-legitimate the whole field in some academic and political eyes, as if the human side of academics has surfaced embarrassingly. However, he argues not only for integration of the peace triad research, teaching and action, and for maintenance of a diversity of approaches and dialogue at different levels, but also for making peace research and education programs responsive to the needs of grass-roots activists. While this has been precisely what has brought down heavy criticism on academic peace work, it raises important issues of responsibility and responsiveness which are an ongoing part of the whole problematic of education. It also resonates with Freire's and Gandhi's concerns about whose interests are neglected, which require attention. These issues in turn underlie the diagnosis and remedy that each sought.

There are two separate ways in which it can be argued that Gandhi and Freire provide a theoretical basis for peace studies or peace education. One is that each presents ideas about the state of the world, and ways to change it, which deserve serious study and from which a university level course can be derived. There are good grounds for including Gandhi and, it is argued, also Freire, in courses which deal with the causes of peacelessness and means to transform it. The desire for change may be variously described as revolutionary, transformative, or utopian. It would take a more detailed critique of each one's actual ideas to suggest that there is insufficient coherence in them, thus providing a rational grounds for rejecting them as an underlying theory for study at university. The ideological grounds for objecting to the content of the theories cannot be answered rationally. And they have each had a significant impact on thought about the state of the world and positive change towards a more just society, though their means to this differed, which gains them a place in the serious study of social change and social movements.

Thus, Gandhi and Freire have a place on campus. And a dialogue which develops their ideas, key concepts, analysis and actions, within contemporary settings, and with appropriate learning processes, provides a fruitful basis for a peace studies or peace education program.

REFERENCES

Alger, C.F. (1989) Peace studies at the crossroads: Where else? In: Lopez, G.A. (Ed.) *Peace studies: Past and future. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 504. Pp. 117-127.

Berger, P.L. (1975) A critical view. Geneva: Churches Commission for Participation in Development *Documents* 7: 'Conscientization'.

Bernstein, H. Ed. (1973) *Underdevelopment and development*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Bing, A.G. (1989) Peace studies as experiential education. In: Lopez, G.A. (Ed.) *Peace studies: Past and future. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 504. Pp. 48-60.

Bondurant, J.V. (1967) *Conquest of violence: The Gandhian philosophy of violence*. (Rev. ed.) Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burns, R.J. (1975) *Higher education and Third World development issues: An international comparative study*. Rome: AD/FAO.

Burns, R.J. (1979) The formation and legitimation of development education with particular reference to Australia and Sweden. Bundoora, Victoria: La Trobe University (unpublished PhD dissertation).

Burns, R. (1981) Knowledge for peace and education. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals, 12*(2), 115-122.

Burns, R. (1983a) Development education in other Western nations. *Canadian and International Education, 12*(3), 33-51.

Burns, R. (1983b) Proposed new BEd Units. Education for the future: Peace education and development education. Bundoora, Victoria: La Trobe University New Subject Review Committee Proposal. (mimeo)

Burns, R. & Aspeslagh, R. Eds. (in press) *Three decades of peace education around the world*. New York: Garland Press.

Burns, R. & Haavelsrud, M. (1979) The structure of peace education. *International Peace Research Newsletter, 19*(4), 11-26.

Camara, H. (1971) *The spiral of violence*. London: Sheed and Ward.

Cardoso, F.H. & Faletto, E. (1979) *Dependency and development in Latin*

America. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Fanon, F. (1967) *The wretched of the earth*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Frank, A.G. (1972) *Lumpenbourgeoisie: Lumpendevelopment – Dependence, class and politics in Latin America*. New York and London: Monthly Review Press.

Freire, P. (1972a:1967) *Cultural action for freedom*. Harmondsworth: Penguin. [transl. L. Slover]

Freire, P. (1972b:1970) *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin. [transl. M.B. Ramos]

Freire, P. (1973) Education, liberation and the church. *Study Encounter*, 9(1), 1-16 (SE/38).

Freire, P. (1974) Thinking with Paulo Freire: Violence. Melbourne: Australian Council of Churches Commission on Christian Education. (audiotape)

Freire, P. (1976:1967) *Education: The practice of freedom*. London: Writers and Readers Publishing Cooperative. [transl. M.B. Ramos]

Freire, P. (1978) *Pedagogy in process. The letters to Guinea-Bissau*. New York: The Seabury Press, in collaboration with the World Council of Churches. [transl. C. St. John Hunter]

Freire, P. (1985) *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation*. London: Macmillan. [transl. D. Macdeo]

Freire, P. & Faundez, A. (1989) *Learning to question: A pedagogy of liberation*. New York: Continuum.

Galtung, J. (1969) Violence, peace and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167-191.

Galtung, J. (1971) A structural theory of imperialism. *Journal of Peace Research*, 8(2), 81-118.

Galtung, J. (1992) *The way is the goal: Gandhi today*. Ahmedabad: Gujarat Vidyapith Peace Research Centre.

Gandhi, M.K. (1939) *Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule*. (Rev. ed.) Ahmedabad: Navajivan.

Gandhi, M.K. (1961) *Non-violent resistance*. New York: Schocken.

Gandhi, M.K. (1968a) Constructive programme: Its meaning and place. In: *The selected works of Mahatma Gandhi*, vol. IV. Pp. 333-374.

Gandhi, M.K. (1968b) Ethical religion. In: *The selected works of Mahatma Gandhi*, vol. IV. Pp. 1-35.

Gandhi, M.K. (1968c) *The selected works of Mahatma Gandhi* (Shriman Narayan ed.). Ahmedabad: Navajivan.

Goulet, D. (1976) Introduction. In: Freire, P. (1976/1967) *Education: The practice of freedom*. London: Writers and Readers Publishing Co-operative. Pp. vii-xiv. [transl. M.B. Ramos]

Gregg, R.B. (1941) *A discipline for non-violence* (First Indian edition.) Ahmedabad: Navajivan.

Gutierrez, G. (1973) *A theology of liberation*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.

Haavelsrud, M. Ed. (1976) *Education for peace: Reflection and action*. London: IPC Science and Technology Press.

Haavelsrud, M. Ed. (1981a) *Towards disarmament education*. Guildford, Surrey: Westbury House.

Haavelsrud, M. (1981b) On inclusion and exclusion. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals, 12*(2), 105-114.

Haavelsrud, M. Ed. (1993) *Disarming: Discourse on violence and peace*. Tromsø, Norway: Arena.

Hill, B. (1974) When I met Marx I continued to meet Christ on the corners of the street. *The Age*, April 23, 21.

Iyer, R. (1973) *The moral and political thought of Mahatma Gandhi*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Klare, M.T. Ed. (1994) *Peace and world security studies*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Kumarappa, B. Editor's note. In: Gandhi, M.K. (1961) *Non-violent resistance*. New York: Schocken. Pp. iii-vi.

Lopez, G.A. (1989) Preface. In: Lopez, G.A. (Ed.) *Peace studies: Past and future. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social*

Science 504. Pp. 9-13.

Lopez, G.A. (1994) Challenges to curriculum development in the post-cold war era. In: Klare, M.T. (Ed.) *Peace and world security studies*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner. Pp. 3-33.

Naess, A. (1965) *Gandhi and the nuclear age*. Totowa, NJ: The Bedminster Press.

Naess, A. (1974) *Gandhi and group conflict: An exploration of satyagraha*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Padrun, R. Ed. (1974) *The school open to the Third World*. Paris: IRFED.

Patel, M.S. (1953) *The educational philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi*. Ahmedabad: Navajivan.

Pearson, L.B. (1970) *The crisis of development*. London: Pall Mall Press.

Prasad, M. (1958) *Social philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi*. Gorakhpur, U.P.: Vishwavidalaya Prakashan.

Sharp, G. (1979) *Gandhi as a political strategist*. Boston: Porter Sargent.

Stephenson, C.M. (1989) The evolution of peace studies / peace research: An historical and international perspective. In: Bretherton, D., Burns, R., Davey, G., Feith, H., Kettle, S. & Mountjoy, G. (Eds.) *Peace studies in Australia and New Zealand*. Melbourne: Victorian Association for Peace Studies. Pp. 18-28.

Sykes, M. (1988) *The story of Nai Talim: Fifty years of education at Sevagram 1937-1987*. Sevagram: Nai Talim Samiti.

Weber, T. (1989) *Hugging the trees: The story of the Chipko movement*. New Delhi: Penguin.

Weber, T. (1991) *Conflict resolution and Gandhian ethics*. New Delhi: Gandhi Peace Foundation.

Weber, T. (1993) The marchers simply walked forward until struck down: Nonviolent suffering and conversion. *Peace and Change, 18*(3), 267-289.

Weber, T. (in press) *Unarmed peacekeeping and Gandhi's peace army: The Shanti Sena*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

White, D. (1973) Paulo Freire, revolutionary extraordinary. *The Age*, July

31, 19.

Young, N. (1981) Educating the peace educators. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals, 12*(2), 123-136.

Zachariah, M. (1986) *Revolution through reform: A comparison of sarvodaya and conscientization*. New York: Praeger.

"Peace Education Miniprints" are published and distributed by the R&D Group "Preparedness for Peace" (address: School of Education, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmö, Sweden).

ISSN 1101-6418